



# புதுச்சேரி மாநில அரசிதழ்

## La Gazette de L'État de Poudouchéry The Gazette of Puducherry

அதிகாரம் பெற்ற வெளியீடு

Publiée par Autorité

Published by Authority

விலை : ₹ 11-00

Prix : ₹ 11-00

Price : ₹ 11-00

எண்	புதுச்சேரி	செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை	2020 ஓ	சனவரி மீ	7 உ
No.	1 Poudouchéry	Mardi	7	Janvier	2020 (17 Pausa 1941)
No.	Puducherry	Tuesday	7th	January	2020

பொருளடக்கம்

SOMMAIRES

CONTENTS

பக்கம்	Page	Page
தொழில் நீதிமன்றத் தீர்ப்புகள்..	2	Sentence arbitral du travail .. 2
		de tribunal.
அரசு அறிவிக்கைகள் ..	9	Notifications du Gouvernement .. 9
ஆபத்தான நிறுவனங்கள் ..	11	Etablissements dangereux .. 11
சாற்றறிக்கைகள் ..	12	Annonces .. 12

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 130/AIL/Lab./T/2019,  
Puducherry, dated 9th December 2019)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D.(L) No. 26/2017, dated 28-08-2019 of the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Puducherry, in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. RVS College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikal and Thiru T. Mukunthan, Karaikal, over non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-05-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

S. MOUTTOULINGAM,  
Under Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT AT PUDUCHERRY

Present : Thiru V. PANDIARAJ, B.Sc., L.L.M.,  
Presiding Officer.

Wednesday, the 28th day of August 2019.

I.D. (L) No. 26/2017

T. Mukunthan,  
No.30, Rayiladi Street,  
Devamapuram,  
Karukangudy Post,  
Thirunallar, Karaikal. . . Petitioner

Versus

M/s. The Managing Director,  
RVS College of Engineering and Technology,  
Kalikuppam, Thiruvattakudy,  
Kottucherry Commune, Karaikal. . . Respondent

This Industrial Dispute coming on 22-08-2019 before me for final hearing in the presence of Thiru N. Ramar, representative for the petitioner, Thiru J. Senthil Raghavan, Advocate filed Vakalat for the respondent and subsequently when the case was posted for respondent evidence, the respondent being called absent and set - *ex parte*, upon hearing the petitioner and perusing the case records, this Court passed the following:

AWARD

1. This Industrial Dispute has been referred by the Government as per the G.O. Rt. No. 68/AIL/Lab./T/2017, dated 28-04-2017 for adjudicating the following:-

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru T. Mugundhan against the management of M/s. RVS College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikal, over non-employment is justified or not?, what relief he is entitled to?

(b) To compute the relief if any, awarded in terms of money if, it can be so computed?

2. The petitioner has filed his claim statement on 20-07-2017, the notice for the respondent/management was served and the respondent has filed its counter on 17-11-2017. Thereafter, the petitioner side documents as Ex.P1 to Ex.P11 were marked with consent of the respondent management and the petitioner side evidence was closed 02-07-2017 itself. Thereafter, this case was posed for respondent side evidence. Even though, sufficient opportunities was given to the respondent it has not come forward to adduce any evidence and therefore, it is set *ex parte* on 01-02-2019.

3. The respondent has filed three documents on its side at the time of filing counter. Though, this respondent was set *ex parte* on 01-02-2019, this Court inclined to peruse the counter and the documents filed along with counter and passed the judgment on merit and not in *ex parte*.

4. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed in the respondent institution during the year 2009 and thereafter, he has continued his work till 03-10-2016. The respondent institution directed this petitioner that he shall attend the work from 03-10-2016 and therefore, this petitioner made the representation before the Conciliation Officer and therefore, the respondent institution has discharged this petitioner on 03-10-2016 itself and it was informed to this petitioner by a letter, dated 04-10-2016. The respondent institution has stated that it has closed its course in Information Technology Department during the year 2013. Further, it has intimated that this petitioner has worked in the Information Technology Department but, actually this petitioner never ever work in the Information Technology Department. This respondent institution has given a false reply before the Conciliation Officer. Since, the petitioner has taken steps before the Conciliation Officer, the respondent institution has discharged the petitioner from his service and thereby caused irreparable loss and hardship to this petitioner.

The action taken down by respondent institution is nothing, but, unfair labour practice, hence, this petitioner has to be reinstated with full back wages and other benefits.

5. The respondent/institution has filed its counter stating that the averment in this petition is not true and denied it as false. Further, it has stated that the petitioner has educational qualification in Information Technology Department and therefore, it is not possible for it to appoint him as Lab Assistant in Electrical and Electronics Engineering Department and therefore, the claim made by the petitioner is not sustainable under the UGC rules. The respondent institution has discharged this petitioner on 03-10-2016 and it was duly intimated to this petitioner by post. Even then, this petitioner refused to receive the same and therefore, it has to be deemed that the discharge order was duly served on this petitioner. Further, there is no Lab Assistant post available in the Information Technology Department. Further, the abovesaid Information Technology Department was already closed during the year 2013 itself and this petitioner has suppressed the material facts and filed his application in sluggish with unclean hands. Further more, this petitioner has lack of interest in his work. Even though, this respondent institution was constrained to and cause warnings on each and every occasions, this petitioner never ever care about it. To prove this petitioner's slackness in his duty, the photographs taken was also marked with the counter. Further, the respondent institution has paid the EPF subscription properly, there is no violation in this aspect. This respondent institution has followed the due process in discharging this petitioner from his service and therefore, he has not entitled for any back wages, hence, this petition has to be dismissed.

6. *On point No. 1 :*

Heard. Records perused. This petitioner has stated that he was appointed in the respondent institution during the year 2009 as Lab Assistant in B.Sc. Electronics Department, in support of this evidence this petitioner has filed Ex.P6 wherein, it has been clearly stated that this petitioner has worked as Lab Assistant in the Electronics Department and joined in the respondent institution on 16-10-2009. Further, the petitioner has pleaded that he has worked as Lab Assistant in B.Ed. Education Department during the year 2010 and then he has worked in the Electrical and Electronic Engineering Department as Lab Assistant. To prove that abovesaid aspects this petitioner has filed Ex.P7 wherein, it has been clearly mentioned that this petitioner has worked as Lab Technician in the Department of

Electrical and Electronic Engineering Department from 15-07-2011 to till 10-10-2014 which is the date of issuance of Ex.P7. Therefore, it is evident that this petitioner has work in the respondent institution from 16-10-2009 in B.Sc., Electronics Department and also in Electrical and Electronic Engineering Department. The respondent institution has not denied abovesaid aspects. Therefore, this Court has come to the conclusion that this petitioner has worked as Lab Assistant from 16-10-2009 in the respondent institution.

7. The petitioner has pleaded the subscription amount that was deducted from the workers were not paid into the ESI Corporation and in this regard, the complainant was given to the ESI Corporation on 09-03-2015 and paper news was also published in Dhinamalar newspaper on 01-05-2015. This petitioner has produced Ex.P1 and Ex.P2 which is in support of the abovesaid pleadings. On perusal of Ex.P5 it is found that enquiry was conducted against the respondent institution for its non-payment of EPF and PF coverage for the period from 01-08-2006 to 31-05-2015. Further, this petitioner has pleaded that in this regard the complainant was also given to the Superintendent of Police, Karaikal and it was also published in the daily newspaper in Dhinamani on 19-05-2015. To prove this aspects this petitioner has produce Ex.P3. Further, this petitioner has sent a letter to the respondent institution seeking the details of his EPF deduction and it was not answered properly. Thus, it is evident that there was some unfair labour practice with respect to the payment of EPF and the ESI Corporation and it was brought to the knowledge of ESI Corporation and the Superintendent of Police by this petitioner. It proves that it creates some sort of vengeance created in the mind of the respondent institution against this petitioner. Further, he has issued a letter to the Labour Department regarding the EPF subscription. On perusal of Ex.P4 and Ex.P5 it seems that the abovesaid petitions were filed on 03-10-2016 and hence, this petitioner has been discharged from service by the respondent institution on that date itself *i.e.*, the petitioner has been removed from the service on 03-10-2016, it was also evident from Ex.P11 and R1. It shows that this petitioner was victimized for his representation made before the Labour Department as per Ex.P4 and Ex.P5.

8. The respondent institution has stated that this petitioner has been discharged from his service as he was not qualify under Information Technology Department, and there is no post available in the Information Technology Department itself and also for the reasons of closure of Information Technology Department. But, to prove this aspects closure of

Information Technology Department and non-availability of vacancy in the Information Technology Department, no single piece of evidence is produced by the respondent. Therefore, the plea taken by this respondent institution for discharge of this petitioner from service not proved by the sufficient evidence and documents. Further, the respondent institution has stated that this petitioner was very much negligent and lack of interest in work and hence, it has constrained to cause warnings each and every occasions, but, no fruitful documents and evidence was produced in support of this aspect, whereas, the respondent has produced the document Ex.R3 which shows that this petitioner is taking rest in the working hours, but, it cannot be taken as a conclusive proof of lack of negligence at the time of working hours as it is not contain any date and time. Even otherwise if, it is taken as a true that cannot be consider as asound ground for discharge. Rather it has shows that the respondent institution has vengeance over this petitioner. So, considering all these aspects this Court come to the conclusion that he was an employee under the respondent institution from 2009 itself and the respondent institution has adopted unfair labour practice and it was brought to the knowledge of the Labour Department by this petitioner, which created vengeance against this petitioner in the minds of the respondent and in result of which this petitioner has been discharged from service without adopting any procedure enumerated under section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act 1947.

9. In the result, this petition is allowed and it is held that the respondent has adopted unfair labour practice against this petitioner and it has violated the provision of 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act and the industrial dispute raised by this petitioner against the respondent, over the non-employment of this petitioner is justified and the Award is passed by directing this respondent to re-instate the abovesaid petitioner in service within one month from the date of this order with full back wages, continuity of service and all other attendance benefits. No costs.

Dictated to Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 28th day of August, 2019.

**V. PANDIARAJ,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-  
Labour Court, Puducherry.

*List of petitioner's witness:*

PW.1 — 01-02-2019 — Srinivasan

*List of petitioner's exhibits:*

- Ex.P1 — 07-03-2015 Copy of letter sent by Mukundhan to the respondent institution for requesting EPF Particulars.
- Ex.P2 — 01-05-2015 Copy of letter sent by EPF Corporation to the respondent institution.
- Ex.P3 — 20-05-2015 Copy of complaint given to the Superintendent of Police, with regard to the non payment of EPS subscription.
- Ex.P4 — 03-10-2016 Copy of letter submitted by Mukundhan to respondent institution requesting EPF receipt.
- Ex.P5 — 04-10-2016 Copy of letter sent by Mukundhan to the Labour Department for requesting job.
- Ex.P6 — 08-12-2010 Copy of Service Certificate of Mukundhan issued by the respondent institution.
- Ex.P7 — 10-10-2014 Copy of Service Certificate of Mukundhan issued by the respondent institution.
- Ex.P8 — 20-10-2016 Copy of termination information given to the Labour Officer, Karaikal, by the respondent institution in regard to termination of Mukundhan.
- Ex.P9 — 22-11-2016 Copy of letter sent by the Mukundhan to the Labour Department, Puducherry.
- Ex.P10 — 18-01-2017 Copy of letter sent by the respondent institution to the Labour Department, Puducherry.
- Ex.P11 — 21-02-2017 Copy of failure report submitted by the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry to Government of Puducherry.

*List of respondent's witnesses:* Nil

*List of respondent's exhibits:* Nil

**V. PANDIARAJ,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-  
Labour Court, Puducherry.

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY**  
**LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No.131/AIL/Lab./T/2019,  
Puducherry, dated 9th December 2019)

**NOTIFICATION**

Whereas, an Award in I.D (L) No.45/2014, dated 31-10-2019 of the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Meris Pharma (India) Private Limited, Karaikal and Thiru P. Ramalingam and 28 others, over non-employment, has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by the Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the Official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

**S. MOUTTOULINGAM,**  
Under Secretary to Government (Labour).

**BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT  
PUDUCHERRY**

*Present :* Thiru V. PANDIARAJ, B.Sc., L.L.M.,  
Presiding Officer,

*Thursday, the 31st day of October, 2019*

**I.D. (L) No. 45/2014**

(1) (2)

1. P. Ramalingam
2. K. Selvi
3. V. Kalaiselvi
4. P. Malar
5. A. Santhanamary
6. Mangayarkarasi
7. P. Pushpavalli
8. M. Umamaheshwary
9. S. Manikandan
10. T. Annammal
11. A. Thamizharasi
12. V. Vasuki
13. S. Devakirubai
14. G. Thenmozhi
15. R. Rani

(1) (2)

16. A.L. Murugan
17. R. Sundararajlu
18. R. Geetha
19. S. Thenmozhi
20. D. Malliga
21. R. Saraswathi
22. A. Alice Regina
23. N. Muthulatchumi
24. N. Kumar
25. G. Sumathi
26. A. Arokiyaraj
27. R. Vanithavalli
28. S. Pudumathi
29. M. Vijayalakshmi . . . Petitioners

*Versus*

The Managing Director,  
M/s. Meirs Pharma (India) Private Limited,  
No. 18, Nehru Nagar Extension,  
Opposite to Children's Park,  
Thalatheru, Karaikal. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on 22-08-2019 before me for final hearing in the presence of Thiru A. Ahamed Ansari, Ameer Associates, Counsel for the petitioners, the respondent being called absent and set - *ex parte*, upon hearing the petitioner and perusing the case records, this Court passed the following:

**A W A R D**

1. This Industrial Dispute has been referred by the Government as per the G.O. Rt. No. 127/AIL/Lab./J/2014, dated 15-10-2014 for adjudicating the following:-

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru P. Ramalingam and 28 others *viz.*, 2. K. Selvi, 3. V. Kalaiselvi, 4. P. Malar, 5. A. Santhanamary, 6. Mangayarkarasi, 7. P. Pushpavalli, 8. M. Umamaheshwary, 9. S. Manikandan, 10. T. Annammal, 11. A. Thamizharasi, 12. V. Vasuki, 13. S. Devakirubai, 14. G. Thenmozhi, 15. R. Rani, 16. A.L. Murugan, 17. R. Sundararajlu, 18. R. Geetha, 19. S. Thenmozhi, 20. D. Malliga, 21. R. Saraswathi, 22. A. Alice Regina, 23. N. Muthulatchumi, 24. N. Kumar, 25. G. Sumathi, 26. A. Arokiyaraj, 27. R. Vanithavalli, 28. S. Pudumathi and 29. M. Vijayalakshmi against the management of M/s. Meris Pharma (India) Private Limited, Varichikudy, Karaikal, over the non-employment is justifiable or not? If justified, what is the relief they are entitled to?

(b) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?



2. In spite of due service of notice to the respondent, the respondent/management has failed to appear before this Court and hence, an *ex parte* order was passed on 24-11-2014.

3. *Brief of the claim petition:*

The respondent factory is at Karaikal and it is the unique factory in manufacturing of nerve meant for sutures in surgical operations. The petitioners are the employees in the abovesaid factory having joined the duty on various dates in various sections. Originally there were 60 employees and in due course it was reduced to 32 workman. The abovesaid factory was under the management of one Mr. R.M. Bairavan and R.M. B. Ramasamy for all these years. It is a private limited company. Their management was not in proper. They have mismanaged and mal administered affairs of the respondent factory and also made huge personnel gain. Due to that mal administration, PIPDIC, Puducherry has taken over the land, building, machineries and other equipments into their custody on 05-07-2011 and since, then, the factory remains closed. No proper notice of closure was given by the respondent management to its workmen. The salary of the workmen for the month of June 2011 has not been paid. Further, the respondent management has to pay Compensation, Provident Fund, Gratuity,

Bonus, ESI benefits and other monetary benefits to its workmen towards the full and final settlement, to their respective claims. The petitioners have received their educational testimonials after a long battle of struggle. The respondent management has appeared before the Conciliation Officer and promised to pay the claims of the petitioner such as Compensation, Provident Fund, Gratuity, Bonus, ESI benefits and other monetary benefits. But, they have not complied the same. The petitioners have already submitted the prescribed application form to withdraw their Provident Fund benefits, but, the respondent management failed to process the same to the respective authorities. The so called Bairavan and Ramasamy has availed loan from ICICI Bank for their personnel gain with a view to defraud the employees. Further, they have diverted the amount of ₹ 54,00,000 paid by one of its customer namely, Hindustan Latex Limited, Thiruvananthapuram for their personnel gain. Due to the non cooperation by the respondent management, the conciliation proceedings comes to an end with its failure report. The petitioners are entitled for the following relief of salary for the month of June 2011, Gratuity, Bonus, Arrears and Compensation as detailed below :-

Sl. No.	Name and Designation	Salary	Year of Joining	Year of leave	Salary 6/11	Gratuity	Bonus arrears	Compensation	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1	P. Ramalingam, A/C Mechanic.	5,800	1992 2002	1997 2011	5,800	40,600	5,800	92,800	1,45,000
2	K. Selvi, Dry/Wet Section.	2,850	2001	2011	2,850	14,250	2,850	31,350	51,300
3	V. Kalaiselvi, Dry/Wet Section.	2,850	2001	2011	2,850	8,400	2,800	16,800	30,800
4	P. Malar, Dry/Wet Section.	2,800	2007	2011	2,800	---	2,800	14,000	19,600
5	A. Sandhanamari, Dry/Wet Section.	2,800	2007	2011	2,800	---	2,800	14,000	19,600
6	Mangayarkarasi, Dry/Wet Section.	3,000	2010	2011	3,000	---	3,000	6,000	12,000
7	P. Pushpavalli, Dry/Wet Section.	2,800	2002	2011	2,800	12,600	2,800	28,000	46,200
8	Umamaheswari, Dry/Wet Section.	3,500	2006	2011	3,500	---	3,500	14,000	21,000
9	S. Manikandan, A/C Section.	3,500	2006	2011	3,500	8,750	3,500	21,000	36,750
10	T. Annammal, A/C Section.	2,450	1992 2002	1997 2011	3,450	24,150	3,450	55,200	86,250

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
11	A. Tamilarasi, A/C Section.	4,800	1992	2011	4,800	45,600	4,800	96,000	1,51,200
12	V. Vasuki, A/C Section.	3,500	2006	2011	3,500	8,750	3,500	21,000	36,750
13	S. Devakirubai, A/C Section.	4,500	2007	2011	4,500	---	4,500	22,500	31,500
14	S. Thenmozhi, A/C Section.	4,500	2002	2011	4,500	20,250	4,500	45,000	74,250
15	R. Rani, A/C Section.	4,800	2002	2011	4,800	21,600	4,800	48,000	79,200
16	Al. Murugan, Accountant.	8,500	1992	2011	Resigned	72,250	8,500	---	80,750
17	R. Sundararaju, Store Keeper.	8,500	1992	2011	8,500	80,750	8,500	1,70,000	2,67,750
18	R. Geetha	2,850	2010	2011	2,850	---	2,850	5,700	11,400
19	G. Thenmozhi	2,850	2009	2011	2,850	---	2,850	8,750	11,250
20	D. Malliga	2,850	2010	2011	2,850	---	2,850	5,700	11,400
21	R. Saraswathi	2,700	2008	2011	2,700	---	2,700	10,800	16,200
22	A. Alice Regina	2,750	2007	2011	2,750	---	2,750	13,750	19,250
23	N. Muthulakshmi	3,100	1992 2002	1999 2009	Resigned	21,700	---	---	21,700
24	N. Kumar	4,850	1996	2008	Resigned	29,100	4,850	---	33,950
25	G. Sumathi	5,500	1998	2008	Resigned	27,500	---	---	27,500
26	A. Arokiasamy	3,300	2003	2010	Resigned	11,550	---	---	11,550
27	R. Vanithavalli	3,450	1992	2008	Resigned	27,600	---	---	27,600
28	A. Pudhumathi	2,850	2006	2008	Resigned	Not	Eligible	---	---
29	M. Vijayalakshmi	3,450	2010	2011	3,450	---	3,450	6,900	13,800

Hence, this petition has to be allowed.

4. In the course of enquiry, PW.1 was examined on the side of the petitioner and no document was marked through his oral evidence. However, copy of some of the records produced before the Conciliation Officer was called for and find place in the case records, for perusal by this Court.

5. *The point for determination is :*

Whether the dispute raised by the 29 petitioners against the management, over non-employment is justified or not? and whether the petitioners are entitled for the relief of arrears salary for the month June, 2011, Gratuity, Bonus, Arrears, Compensation and for direction of Provident Fund through the respondent management from the respective authorities?

6. Heard. Perused the documents and the oral evidence available on the side of the petitioners.

7. The evidence of PW.1 was perused. He has deposed that these petitioners are the employees of the respondent factory and it remains closed from 05-07-2011 because of the mismanagement and mal administration by the responsible persons, by name, RM. Bairavan and RM.P. Ramasamy. Further, he has deposed that the petitioners are unable to get their salary for the month of June 2011 because of the closure of the factory, due to the mal administration. He has further, deposed that the petitioners have approached the Conciliation Officer and the conciliation proceedings come to an end with failure report because of the non-cooperation by the respondent management. He has further deposed that the respondent management has failed to comply the assurance given by them. He has also deposed that the respondent management failed to process their Provident Fund application to the respective authorities. All these evidences are supporting the plea raised by them in their claim statement. On perusal of the copy of the records produced by the Labour Department before this Court, this Court found that these petitioners filed the

representation before the Conciliation Officer for their claim and it shows that they have raised industrial dispute for the redressal of the same by the Conciliation Officer. Further, on perusal of abovesaid records it seems that the Conciliation Officer has taken efforts for the settlement and because of non-cooperation by the respondent management, it comes to an end with its failure report. Hence, on perusal of the records available with the case bundle and on perusal of oral evidence adduced by the PW.1 this Court found that the claim raised by these petitioners became genuine and justifiable one. Further, the claim of these petitioners was not denied by the respondent management through its appearance and by filing counter before this Tribunal. Hence, unchallenged version of PW.1 make the claim of these petitioners as justifiable one. Hence, this petition found to be allowed.

7. In the result, this petition is allowed and it is held that the dispute raised by these petitioners against the respondent/management regarding the non-payment of

salary for the month June 2011, Arrears, Bonus, Gratuity and Compensation becomes justifiable as detailed in the table, annexed with this award.

Dictated to Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 31st day of October, 2019.

**V. PANDIARAJ,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-  
Labour Court, Puducherry.

*Both side no evidence and no exhibits.*

**V. PANDIARAJ,**  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-  
Labour Court, Puducherry.

#### ANNEXURE

Sl. No.	Name and Designation	Salary	Year of Joining	Year of leave	Salary 6/11	Gratuity	Bonus arrears	Compensation	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1	P. Ramalingam, A/C Mechanic.	5,800	1992 2002	1997 2011	5,800	40,600	5,800	92,800	1,45,000
2	K. Selvi, Dry/Wet Section.	2,850	2001	2011	2,850	14,250	2,850	31,350	51,300
3	V. Kalaiselvi, Dry/Wet Section.	2,850	2001	2011	2,850	8,400	2,800	16,800	30,800
4	P. Malar, Dry/Wet Section.	2,800	2007	2011	2,800	---	2,800	14,000	19,600
5	A. Sandhanamari, Dry/Wet Section.	2,800	2007	2011	2,800	---	2,800	14,000	19,600
6	Mangayarkarasi, Dry/Wet Section.	3,000	2010	2011	3,000	---	3,000	6,000	12,000
7	P. Pushpavalli, Dry/Wet Section.	2,800	2002	2011	2,800	12,600	2,800	28,000	46,200
8	Umamaheswari, Dry/Wet Section.	3,500	2006	2011	3,500	---	3,500	14,000	21,000
9	S. Manikandan, A/C Section.	3,500	2006	2011	3,500	8,750	3,500	21,000	36,750
10	T. Annammal, A/C Section.	2,450	1992 2002	1997 2011	3,450	24,150	3,450	55,200	86,250
11	A. Tamilarasi, A/C Section.	4,800	1992	2011	4,800	45,600	4,800	96,000	1,51,200
12	V. Vasuki, A/C Section.	3,500	2006	2011	3,500	8,750	3,500	21,000	36,750
13	S. Devakirubai, A/C Section.	4,500	2007	2011	4,500	---	4,500	22,500	31,500



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
14	S. Thenmozhi, A/C Section.	4,500	2002	2011	4,500	20,250	4,500	45,000	74,250
15	R. Rani, A/C Section.	4,800	2002	2011	4,800	21,600	4,800	48,000	79,200
16	Al. Murugan, Accountant.	8,500	1992	2011	Resigned	72,250	8,500	---	80,750
17	R. Sundararaju, Store Keeper.	8,500	1992	2011	8,500	80,750	8,500	1,70,000	2,67,750
18	R. Geetha	2,850	2010	2011	2,850	---	2,850	5,700	11,400
19	G. Thenmozhi	2,850	2009	2011	2,850	---	2,850	8,750	11,250
20	D. Malliga	2,850	2010	2011	2,850	---	2,850	5,700	11,400
21	R. Saraswathi	2,700	2008	2011	2,700	---	2,700	10,800	16,200
22	A. Alice Regina	2,750	2007	2011	2,750	---	2,750	13,750	19,250
23	N. Muthulakshmi	3,100	1992 2002	1999 2009	Resigned	21,700	---	---	21,700
24	N. Kumar	4,850	1996	2008	Resigned	29,100	4,850	---	33,950
25	G. Sumathi	5,500	1998	2008	Resigned	27,500	---	---	27,500
26	A. Arokiasamy	3,300	2003	2010	Resigned	11,550	---	---	11,550
27	R. Vanithavalli	3,450	1992	2008	Resigned	27,600	---	---	27,600
28	A. Pudhumathi	2,850	2006	2008	Resigned	Not	Eligible	---	---
29	M. Vijayalakshmi	3,450	2010	2011	3,450	---	3,450	6,900	13,800

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY  
HOME DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Ms. No. 96, Puducherry, dated 13th December 2019)

**NOTIFICATION**

In the Circular No. A.12021/07/2018/Home/Pl, dated 28-11-2018, the tentative seniority list of Pondicherry Police Service (Entry Grade) Officers, who were appointed both under direct recruitment quota and promotion quota, was circulated to all concerned calling for objections, if any. Accordingly, objections were received from few Pondicherry Police Service Officers and the same were examined carefully.

2. Their objections were considered based on the guidelines of seniority and as per O.M. No. 20011/I/2012-Estt.(D), dated 04-03-2014 of DoPT, New Delhi. After careful scrutiny, the objections were found to be lacking in substance and were finally disposed of as having no merits. Therefore, the tentative seniority list is finalized and the final seniority list of the regularly appointed Pondicherry Police Service (Entry Grade) Officers from the year 1991 to 2018 shall be as under:

Seniority No.	Name of the Pondicherry Police Service Officer	Direct Recruit/ Promotee	Date of Regular Appointment	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Shri./Smt. :			
14	Paraminderjit Singh	DR (CSE-'91)	08-06-1993	Resigned
15	Sreenivas Raj Betham	DR (CSE-'93)	20-07-1995	Resigned
16	Feroze Zia Hussain	DR (CSE-'94)	06-08-1996	Resigned